



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,466	01/25/2001	Toshiyuki Takao	FF-0131US	3951
21254	7590	02/23/2006	EXAMINER	
MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC			ZHOU, TING	
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 200			2173	
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817				

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/768,466	TAKAO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ting Zhou	2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3, 6-10, 13-17 and 20-35 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3, 6-10, 13-17 and 20-35 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 7 December 2006 have been received and entered. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-17 and 20-35 as amended are pending in the application.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 33 is objected to because of the following informalities: There are two claims numbered to be claim 33. For prosecution purposes, the examiner assumes that this is a typological error and that the second claim 33 was intended to be claim 34. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-17 and 20-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- Claim 1 recites the limitations "the position", "the result" and "the amount" in lines 5, 9-10 and 22 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claims 2-3 and 6-7 are rejected based on the same rationale as applied to claim 1.

- Claim 8 recites the limitations “the information pasting regions”, “the position”, “said paste-up information setting unit”, “said operation screen creating unit”, “said paste-up information receiving unit” and “the amount” in lines 3, 5, 8-9, 12, 18-19 and 21 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claims 9-10 and 13 are rejected based on the same rationale as applied to claim 8.
- Claim 14 recites the limitations “said paste-up information storing unit” and “said plurality of control terminals” in lines 3 and 6 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claim 15 recites the limitations “the position”, “the information paste-up regions”, “the new operation screen”, “said paste-up information setting unit”, “said paste-up information receiving unit” and “the amount” in lines 5, 5, 8, 8-9, 18-19 and 21 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claims 16-17 and 20 are rejected based on the same rationale as applied to claim 15.

- Claim 21 recites the limitations “said paste-up information storing unit” and “said plurality of control terminals” in lines 3 and 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claim 22, recites the limitations “said remote terminal” and “the amount” on lines 12 and 16 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claims 23-26 are rejected based on the same rationale as applied to claim 22.
- Claim 27 recites the limitations “said paste-up information”, “said barycenter”, “said paste-up information receiving unit” and “the amount” on lines 10, 13, 13-14 and 16 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claim 28 recites the limitation “said information paste-up regions” on line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claim 29 recites the limitation “said operation screen creating unit” on lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

- Claim 30 recites the limitations “said operation screen creating unit” and “said information paste-up regions” on lines 1-2 and 3 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claim 31 recites the limitation “said information paste-up regions” on lines 3 and 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claim 32 recites the limitations “said paste-up information”, “said barycenter”, “said paste-up information receiving unit”, “the amount” on lines 9, 12, 12-13 and 15 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claim 33 recites the limitations “said information paste-up regions” on line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claim 34 is rejected based on the same rationale as claim 32.
- Claim 35 recites the limitation “said information paste-up regions” on lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-17 and 20-35 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:
The present invention teaches the creation of an operation screen. Each of independent claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 27 and 32 identifies the distinct feature of conducting the automatic positioning setting process when the paste-up information is moved to the amount of a predetermined ratio in a predetermined position on the operation screen in which the paste-up information is to be pasted. The closest prior art, Cannon et al. (U.S. Patent 5,748,484) and Microsoft® Word 2000, (Screenshots 1-8) teach an automatic positioning setting process that is capable of editing the position and size of the information pasting region. In the case of the Cannon et al. reference, Cannon et al. teach an automatic positioning setting process for coinciding a barycenter of paste-up information with a predetermined point on the operation screen (automatically positioning the signature or picture in a specified position relative to the rest of the card) (Cannon et al.: column 12, lines 32-40). In the case of the Microsoft Word reference, Microsoft Word teaches editing a position and size of the information pasting region (the pictures toolbar allows users to edit information such as the size, via the crop tool, of the information pasting region, i.e. the pasted image) (Microsoft Word: Screenshot 3). However, the prior art of record fails to explicitly teach the automatic positioning setting process is conducted when the paste-up information is moved to the amount of a predetermined ratio in a predetermined position on the operation screen in which the paste-up information is to be pasted, and thus fails to anticipate or render the above limitations obvious.

6. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (571) 272-4058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached at (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TZ

Krenbren Jr